UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/534,430 | 07/18/2005 | Anthony Spencer | 0120-034 | 5040 |

42015      7590      06/26/2009
POTOMAC PATENT GROUP PLLC
P. O. BOX 270
FREDERICKSBURG, VA 22404

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| CHOE, YONG J |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2185 | |

| NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 06/26/2009 | ELECTRONIC |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

tammy@ppglaw.com

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 March 2009</u>.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.          2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>19-46</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) <u>19-46</u> is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some *  c)☐ None of:
      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1.    The examiner acknowledges the applicant's submission of the

amendment filed on 03/02/2009.  At this point, new claims 36-46 have been

added.   Thus, claims 19-46 are pending in the instant application.

### *Response to Arguments*

2.    Applicant's arguments with respect to **claim 41** has been considered but

are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Claim Objections*

3.    **Claims 46** is objected to because of the following informalities:  The

phrase of "A state engine as claimed in claim 32" should be "The parallel

processor as claimed in claim 32".  Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

4.    The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and
> process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any
> person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make
> and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying
> out his invention.

5.    **Claims 39-46** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing

to comply with the written description requirement.  The amended claim(s)

contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a

way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s),

at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

**Regarding claims 39-46**, each of the newly added claimed limitations

recited in claims 39-46 is not described in applicant's original disclosure.

6.      The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

**Claims 46** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter

which applicant regards as the invention.  It is unclear how one <u>single state

engine</u> could comprise <u>a plurality of state engines</u>.

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

7.      The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
> as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be
> patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the
> time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter
> pertains.  Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.      **Claims 19-40** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over **Steely, Jr. et al. (US Patent No.: US 6088771)** in view of **Dieffenderfer et**

**al. (US Patent No.: US 5822608)**.

**<u>Regarding independent claims 19,32,35,37 and 38,</u>** Steely discloses a

state engine (Fig.2: switch 200) receiving multiple requests from a multiple

processor system (Fig.2: multiple processor system) for a shared state (Fig.2:

shared memory 150), the state engine (Fig.2: switch 200) comprising:

at least one state element (Fig.2: arbiter 240) means, said at least one

state element (Fig.2: arbiter 240) means adapted to operate, atomically, on said

shared state (Fig.2: shared memory 150) in response to a request made by said

multiple processor system (Fig.2: multiple processor system) (Fig.2; and col.9,

lines 26-51; and col.10, lines 24-54: The switch receives multiple requests from

multiple processors for shared memory and arbiter operates the requests

received from multiple processors) (Fig.2 and col.6, lines 1-17: the coherence

controller 180 and IOP 130 control the arbiter to operate data selected by the

arbiter on shared memory through Arb bus 170), wherein

said request includes at least a command directing said at least one state

element means on how to perform an operation on said shared state (Fig.2; and

col.9, lines 26-51; and col.10, lines 24-54: The switch receives multiple requests

from multiple processors for shared memory and arbiter operates the requests

received from multiple processors) (Fig.2 and col.6, lines 1-17: the coherence

controller 180 and IOP 130 control the arbiter to operate data selected by the

arbiter on shared memory through Arb bus 170); and

a memory (Fig.2: the queues 212-220) connected to said at least one

state element means and configured to store said shared state (Fig.2: the

queues 212-220 that are configured to store shared data is included in switch

200 which includes arbiter 240.  Thus the queues connected to the arbiter 240

are included in the switch).

Steely further teaches means to supply data to update said shared state

(Fig.1: data is transferred from processors to the shared memory. Thus, the

data is supplied to update the shared memory).

However, Steely does not specifically teach the request is made by said

parallel processor.

Dieffenderfer teaches teach the request is made by said parallel

processor. (Fig.4 and col.12, lines 51-53: Fig.4 illustrates a basic picket

configuration of a plurality of parallel processors and memories, picket units,

arranged in a row on a single silicon chip as part of a parallel array which may be

configured as a SIMD subsystem.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate the parallel processor as taught by

Dieffenderfer into multiple processor system with shared memory of Steely

because each processor may execute a separate program operating on a

separate data set (col.1 line 65 – col.2, line 3). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to combine the parallel processor as taught by Dieffenderfer with

multiple processor system with shared memory of Steely to obtain the invention.


**Regarding claim 20**, Steely teaches wherein the operation performed by

said at least one state element means is a single read-modify-write operation

(col.6, lines 29-33: Probes include Forwarded Read (Frd) commands, Forwarded

Read Modify commands and invalidate commands. Forwarded-Read-Modify is

analogous to the read-write-modify operation).

**Regarding claim 21**, Steely teaches wherein said shared state comprises a single item of state (Fig.2: single shared memory 150).

**Regarding claim 22**, Steely teaches wherein said shared state comprises multiple items of state (col.10, lines 31-32: there may be multiple banks of the shared memory).

**Regarding claim 23**, Steely teaches wherein said state comprises a single storage location or a data structure in storage (Fig.2 and col.5, line 54: A shared data structure 160 is provided).

**Regarding claim 24**, Steely teaches wherein the operation performed by said at least one state element means is carried out as a fixed or hardwired operation (Fig.2: arbiter is implemented in hardware. Thus the arbiter (i.e., state element means) is carried out as a hardwired operation unless a programmed operation is mentioned).

**Regarding claim 25**, Steely teaches supplying data to update said shared state (col.4, lines 22-34: arbiter select a request received from multiple processor and update the shared memory).

**Regarding claim 26**, Steely teaches sending a command and data to said shared state, whereby said operation is programmable (col.1, lines 11-24).

**Regarding claim 27**, Steely teaches a plurality of said state element means organized into state cell means, whereby operations performed on said shared state are pipelined (see Fig.2 and col.4, lines 22-34: i.e., atomic ordering process).

**Regarding claims 28**, Steely teaches a plurality of said state cell means, whereby to allow multiple requests to be handled concurrently (col.10, lines 31-33: there may be multiple banks of the shared memory and multiple request queues per processor).

**Regarding claim 29**, Steely teaches input and output interconnect means providing access to and from said state cell means, a bus interface for said input and output interconnect means, said bus interface interfacing with a system bus and a control unit of a processing element for controlling accesses to said shared state (col.6, lines 61-67 and col.7, lines 1-12: FIG. 2 is a schematic block diagram of the local switch 200 comprising a plurality of ports 202-210, each of which is coupled to a respective processor (P1-P4) 102-108 and IOP 130 via a full-duplex, bi-directional clock forwarded data link. Each port includes a first-in, first-out (FIFO) input and output queue set; that is, each port includes a respective input (request) queue 212-220 for receiving, e.g., a memory reference request issued by its processor, a respective output (probe) queue 222-230 for receiving, e.g., a memory reference probe issued by system control logic associated with the switch, and a respective output (fill) queue 262-270 for receiving, e.g., requested data provided by another processor of the system. An arbiter 240 arbitrates among the input queues to grant access to the Arb bus 170 where the requests are ordered into a memory reference request stream. In the illustrative embodiment, the arbiter selects the requests stored in the input queues for access to the bus in accordance with an arbitration policy, such as a conventional round-robin algorithm).

**Regarding claim 30**, Steely teaches wherein each said state element means comprises local memory, and each field of a data record is stored in a respective memory of a respective state element means (col.5, lines 54-67).

**Regarding claim 31**, Dieffenderfer teaches wherein each said state element means comprises a local memory for said shared state, an arithmetic unit adapted to perform the operation on said state in said local memory, and command and control logic to control said operation (col.18, lines 1-12).

**Regarding claim 33**, Dieffenderfer teaches wherein said parallel processor is an array processor (see Fig.4).

**Regarding claim 34**, Dieffenderfer teaches wherein said array processor is a SIMD processor (Fig.4 and col.12, lines 51-53: Fig.4 illustrates a basic picket configuration of a plurality of parallel processors and memories, picket units, arranged in a row on a single silicon chip as part of a parallel array which may be configured as a SIMD subsystem.).

**Regarding claim 37**, Dieffenderfer teaches teach a parallel processor implemented on a single silicon chip (Fig.4 and col.12, lines 51-53: Fig.4 illustrates a basic picket configuration of a plurality of parallel processors and memories, picket units, arranged in a row on a single silicon chip as part of a parallel array which may be configured as a SIMD subsystem.).

**Regarding claim 39**, Steely teaches wherein said operation results in a change of said shared state (see Fig.2; and col.4, lines 22-34; and col.6, lines 29-33).

**Regarding claim 40**, Steely teaches wherein said state engine is a programmable entity capable of executing shared memory instrucitons (col.1, lines 11-24).

9.      **Claim 41** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Steely, Jr. et al. (US Patent No.: US 6088771)** in view of **Dieffenderfer et al. (US Patent No.: US 5822608)** and further in view of **Tetrick (US Publication No.: US 2001/0021967).**

**Regarding claim 41**, Steely and Dieffenderfer do not specifically teach said memory is within said state element.

However, Tetrick teaches said memory (i.e., queue) is within said state element (i.e., arbiter). ([0018]: The arbiter includes a queue for normal priority requests for using the address and data lines 235 and a high priority queue for using the address and data lines 235).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the arbiter including a queue as taught by Tetrick into multiple processor system with shared memory of Steely as modified by Dieffenderfer so that a high priority queue requests can be accessed first. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the arbiter including a queue as taught by Tetrick with multiple processor system with shared memory of Steely as modified by Dieffenderfer to obtain the invention.

## *Allowable Subject Matter*

10.    **Claims 42-46** would be allowable if rewritten in independent form

including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and

overcome rejection under *35 USC § 112* .

## *Response to Arguments*

11.    Applicant's arguments filed on 03/02/2009 have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive.

### 1<u>st</u> Point of Argument

Regarding Applicant's remarks on page 13, the applicants argue that the

command issued in Steely for routing the data cannot reasonably be considered

an "operation" on a shared state as claimed by applicant.

In response, the arbiter in switch of Steely operates requested received

from multiple processors.  Thus, Steely clearly teaches said request includes at

least a command directing said at least one state element means on how to

perform an operation on said shared state (Fig.2; and col.9, lines 26-51; and

col.10, lines 24-54: The switch receives multiple requests from multiple

processors for shared memory and arbiter operates the requests received from

multiple processors) (Fig.2 and col.6, lines 1-17: the coherence controller 180

and IOP 130 control the arbiter to operate data selected by the arbiter on shared

memory through Arb bus 170);

### 2ⁿᵈ Point of Argument

Regarding Applicant's remarks on page 14, the applicants argue that the memory of Steely is separate from the switch and as such is not a part of the switch and does not meet the claims.

In response, Steely clearly teaches a memory (Fig.2: the queues 212-220) connected to said at least one state element means and configured to store said shared state (Fig.2: the queues 212-220 that are configured to store shared data is included in switch 200 which includes arbiter 240. Thus the queues connected to the arbiter 240 are included in the switch. Queues are a type of memory).

### 3ʳᵈ Point of Argument

Regarding Applicant's remarks on page 15, the applicants argue that Steely does not disclose applicant's claim 1 combination of "said at least one state element adapted to operate, atomically, on said shared state".

In response, Steely clearly teaches said at least one state element (Fig.2: arbiter 240) adapted to operate, atomically, on said shared state (Fig.2: shared memory 150) in response to a request made by said multiple processor system (Fig.2: multiple processor system) (Fig.2; and col.9, lines 26-51; and col.10, lines 24-54: The switch receives multiple requests from multiple processors for shared memory and arbiter operates the requests received from multiple processors) (Fig.2 and col.6, lines 1-17: the coherence controller 180 and IOP

130 control the arbiter to operate data selected by the arbiter on shared memory

through Arb bus 170),


## 4<u>th</u> Point of Argument

Regarding Applicant's remarks on page 15, the applicants argue that

Dieffenderfer fails to teach or suggest that the SIMD processor modifies shared

state in a shared memory for other processors.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain

features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant

relies (i.e., "modifying shared state in a shared memory for other processors") are

not recited in the rejected claim(s).  Although the claims are interpreted in light of

the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.

See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).


### *Conclusion*

12.    **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. Applicant is reminded of the extension of

time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire

THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is

filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory

action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory

period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory

action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.


13.     Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to **Yong**

**Choe** at telephone number **571-270-1053** or email to **yong.choe@uspto.gov**.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am to 5:00pm.  If attempts to

reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

**Sanjiv Shah** can be reached on **571-272-4098**.  Any inquiry of a general nature

or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100

whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.


14.     Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PMR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private

PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

irect.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free).


/Yong  Choe/                                    /Tuan V. Thai/
                                               Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2185

Examiner, Art Unit 2185